

Only one of the ablation probes disclosed in Perkins, i.e., the ablation probe 132, comprises a plurality of electrodes. Second, claim 1 requires the first and second ablation devices be configured for simultaneously creating first and second lesions. In contrast, Perkins does not disclose that the ablation devices 130, 132 are in a configuration that allows them to simultaneously create first and second lesions. Notably, although Perkins illustrates all three of the ablation devices 130, 132 connected to the control unit 14, this does not necessarily mean that the control unit 14 is configured in such a way as to allow simultaneous delivery of ablation energy to the probes. In fact, Perkins discloses just the opposite by stating the ablation devices are designed to be operated one at a time (see col. 5, lines 62-68).

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 1, as well as the claims depending therefrom (claims 2-7 and 19), are not anticipated by Perkins, and as such, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Perkins. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since Perkins does not disclose, teach, or suggest the combination of elements required by these claims.

In particular, independent claim 8 requires the first and second electrode arrays to be coupled in parallel and further requires the simultaneous delivery of energy to the first and second electrode arrays. Not only does Perkins fail to disclose the existence of a second electrode array as pointed out by the Examiner, Perkins does not disclose that the ablation devices 130, 132 be connected in parallel, and as discussed above, do not disclose the simultaneous delivery of energy to the ablation devices 130, 132.


Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 8, as well as the claims depending therefrom (claims 9-18 and 20), are not obvious over Perkins, and as such, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (714) 830-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2005


Michael J. Bolan
Reg. No. 42,339

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Customer No. 23639